REMARKS

Claims 1-15, 18-57, and 59-93 are pending. Claims 1, 59, 60, 80 and 93 are independent. Claims 15, 26, 52, 57, 79, 80, and 93 are amended herein to correct minor grammatical errors. No new matter has been added. Applicants respectfully submit that this amendment does not present new issues requiring further consideration or search because the same claim limitations were contained in the previously presented version of the claims.

Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-8, 13-15, 18-20, 58-71, 78-79, and 93 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ambroziak (U.S. Patent No. 6,415,319) in view of Danneels (U.S. Patent No. 6,038,598). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Saving Web Page or Requested Data

Ambroziak, the Examiner's primary reference, and the present invention address entirely different problems and provide entirely different functionality. Accordingly, there is simply no evidence that Ambroziak discloses, teaches, or suggests specific aspects of the pending claims.

Ambroziak's disclosed system seeks to provide enhanced searching capabilities by organizing web page data based on the concepts contained in the web page data. To this end, Ambroziak extracts conceptual information from the content of the web page, analyzes the extracted conceptual information semantically and assimilates the extracted conceptual information into an index. The index is designed to record conceptual relationships among the extracted data in a "hierarchically organized taxonomy of word and phrase concepts." (Ambroziak, col. 3, lines 26-29). Ambroziak, therefore, extracts, reorganizes and stores conceptual portions of the user's browsed web data.

Pending independent claims 1, 59, 60 and 93, require "saving means for saving web page data...;" "a saving step of saving the web page data...;" "saving the web page data...;" and "saving means for saving the requested data...," respectively. Contrary to the Examiner's assertion, Ambroziak does not disclose saving web page data as required by each of these claims. In Ambroziak the data saved in index 140 is not the web page and cannot be used to recreate the web page. The data saved in index 140 is merely isolated words and phrases extracted from the web page. (Ambroziak, col. 9, lines 34-65; "Index server 130 **parses** the web page ... and then **extract[s]** words from the Web page;" "Index server 130 then assimilates **the words and phrases extracted from the Web page** into index 140...." (emphasis added)). The content of Amborziak's index 140 is further demonstrated by FIG. 14, which shows a "concept browser" displaying a portion of index 140. (Ambroziak, col. 8, lines 17-27). Accordingly, the index server in Ambroziak does not save "web page data" or "requested data" as required by claims 1, 59, 60 or 93. Instead, Ambroziak only teaches using the index server to extract conceptual information from web pages so that the extracted conceptual information can be saved in the index 140.

Furthermore, when a user of Ambroziak's system searches concepts in index 140 for specified text and selects one of the URLs, the browser 210 is required to "access the identified server and to **retrieve** and display **the corresponding Web page**." (Ambroziak, col. 9, lines 1-2 (emphasis added)). Thus, Ambroziak's system does not save web page data as the Examiner suggests, at best, it merely saves a link to web page data.

893219 v3

Setting a Condition

The Examiner admits that Ambroziak does not specifically teach "setting a condition for web page data to be saved." The Examiner, however, asserts that Danneels discloses this limitation. (*See* November 22, 2004 Office Action at page 6). Applicants respectfully disagree.

Danneels is directed to a web server system that allows a web server to select which web page is returned when a particular URL is received. Thus, Danneels address a mechanism for a content provider to selectively change its displayed content. In Danneels' system a set of web pages is mapped to a single URL. Each web page in the set has one or more conditions associated with it. Upon receiving a request for the data at the single URL, the web server evaluates conditions associated with web pages in the corresponding set and returns a web page whose condition has been satisfied. (*See* Danneels' Abstract).

Pending independent claims 1, 59 and 60, require "setting means for setting a condition for web page data to be saved...;" "a setting step of setting a condition for web page data to be saved...;" "setting a condition for web page data to be saved...;" respectively. Danneels' only allows setting of conditions for determining which web pages are to be served by a web server. Danneels' conditions are irrelevant to whether a content user sets a condition to save a page prior to acquiring the web page data. In Danneels, while, the conditions themselves might be saved, they are not used for determining which web pages should be saved by the user acquiring the web page data. Thus, Danneels does not teach or suggest setting a condition relating to saving a web page as Applicants claim.

While the Examiner admits that Ambroziak does not teach setting a condition for web page data to be saved, the Examiner maintains that Ambroziak **does** teach the other

limitations of the pending claims reliant on that condition. For example, the Examiner asserts

that Ambroziak discloses at col. 8, lines 65-67, col. 9, lines 1-2, lines 16-22 a "determination

means for determining whether the acquired web page data satisfies the condition." (*See*

November 22, 2004 Office Action at page 4). Applicants respectfully disagree.

In the section of Ambroziak that was cited by the Examiner, Ambroziak merely

discloses searching concepts in index 140 for user specified text. The results of the search are

displayed in a user interface, which allows the user to view indexed concepts containing the

specified text and corresponding URLs. (*See* Ambroziak, FIGS. 12-13). Concepts are added to

the taxonomy index 140 by "parsing the retrieved Web page, and assimilating the concepts in the

Web page into taxonomy index 140 using lexical database 150." (Ambroziak, col. 6, lines 18-

21).

Claim 1, however, recites a "setting means for setting a condition for web page

data to be saved, **in advance of acquiring the web page data**" and a "determination means for

determining whether the acquired web page data satisfies the condition." (emphasis added).

Furthermore, since Ambroziak fails to disclose a "setting means for setting **a condition** for web

page data to be saved, in advance of acquiring the web page data" as conceded by the Examiner,

Ambroziak also necessarily fails to disclose a "determination means for determining whether the

acquired web page data satisfies **the condition**" as Applicants claim. (emphasis added) Claims

59 and 60 contain similar limitations, which are similarly absent in Ambroziak.

In summary, Ambroziak does not teach or suggest storing web page data based on

evaluating a condition that has been set prior to acquiring the web page data. Danneels is

directed to a web server system on which conditions are set for serving different web pages,

when a particular URL is received by the web server. Danneels' invention is directed to an

improved web server system. Standard web browser systems are used with Danneels' web

server system. Thus, Danneels does not teach or suggest modifying a web browser system.

Therefore, there is no motivation in Danneels or Ambroziak to combine web browsing and web

serving systems to arrive at the claimed invention. Furthermore, as noted above, one skilled in

the art could not combine the teachings of Ambroziak and Danneels to produce Applicants'

invention.

With respect to the basic requirements for a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure ("MPEP") provides:

> To establish a *prima facie* of obviousness, three basic
> criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or
> motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge
> generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the
> reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must
> be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art
> reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all
> the claim limitations.

MPEP §2143 (Rev. 2, May 2004). Applicants respectfully submit that there is no *prima facie*

case of obviousness because (1) there is no motivation in either cited reference to modify

Ambroziak to store web page data based on evaluating a condition that has been set prior to

acquiring the web page data; and/or (2) the combination of Ambroziak and Danneels does not

teach or suggest all of the limitations of independent claims 1, 59, 60 and 93.

Based on the foregoing remarks, independent claims 1, 59, 60 and 93 clearly

articulate distinctions between the present invention and data processing systems, such as those

disclosed in Ambroziak and Danneels. Claims 2-8, 13-15, 18-20, 58, 60, 71, 78, and 79, which

ultimately depend from one of the above independent claims, are believed to define patentable

subject matter for at least similar reasons.

893219 v3

Claims 80-92 were rejected as being obvious in view of Kraft (U.S. Patent No. 6,516,312). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Independent claim 80 recites a data processing method comprising the steps of "extracting data within a predetermined meta tag from a web page retrieved by a browser" and "displaying, when the retrieved web page is displayed in an area, the extracted data in a predetermined field outside of the area."

The examiner asserts that Kraft discloses "displaying, when the retrieved web page is displayed in an area, the extracted data in a predetermined field outside of the area" at col. 7, lines 41-46, col. 11, line 22-38. (*See* November 22, 2004 Office Action at page 24). Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's characterization of Kraft.

Kraft discloses a search engine repository 210 that maintains information from previously encountered web pages, which is used by an abstract/indexing engine 220 to prepare abstracts that are stored in an abstracts/indexed data repository 260. (*See* Kraft, col. 7, lines 3-6). Abstracts contain dynamic data associated with keywords that are derived from a domain-specific dictionary 110; the dynamic data represents pointers, links, or URLs to external data repositories. (*See* Kraft, col. 4, lines 15-20).

A query transformer 230 receives a user's query from a user browser 140. (Kraft, col., lines 22-23). The query transformer 230 applies an internal query request to the abstracts/indexed data and generates search results that matches the user's query. (*See* Kraft, col. 7, lines 22-26). Exemplary search results are shown in FIG. 6A. As shown in FIG. 6B, the user can learn more about a domain-specific term by selecting a link to the term and a new browser window 400 appears and "**displays the search result** for the term." (Kraft, col. 11, lines 29-32 (emphasis added)). As shown in FIG. 6C, if the new browser window 400 contains another

893219 v3

domain-specific term, the user can select a link to this term and another browser window 402

appears and "**displays the search result** for the term." (Kraft, col. 11, lines 34-38 (emphasis

added)).

In each of the display windows that are shown in FIGS. 6A-6C, only search

results are displayed. There is no corresponding web page displayed from which information

was extracted. When the user selects a domain-specific term from a search results display, the

user is actually selecting a link to an external data repository, which results in information from

the external data repository being displayed in a different browser window. The data shown in

browser window 400 comes from the abstracts/indexed data repository 260. That is, the data

shown in browser window 400 it is not extracted from a meta tag that is contained in the display

of FIG. 6A.

Therefore, Kraft fails to disclose, teach, or suggest "extracting data within a

predetermined meta tag from a web page retrieved by a browser; and displaying, when the

retrieved web page is displayed in an area, the extracted data in a predetermined field outside of

the area" as recited in claim 80.

Based on the foregoing remarks, claim 80 clearly articulates distinctions between

the present invention and data processing systems, such as those disclosed in Kraft. Claims 81-

92, which ultimately depend from the above claims, are believed to define patentable subject

matter for at least similar reasons.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request

reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims and allowance of this application.

893219 v3

AUTHORIZATION

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for consideration of this Amendment to Deposit Account No. 13-4500, Order No. 4233-4002. A DUPLICATE OF THIS DOCUMENT IS ATTACHED.

In the event that an extension of time is required, or which may be required in addition to that requested in a petition for an extension of time, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to Deposit Account No. 13-4500, Order No. 4233-4002. A DUPLICATE OF THIS DOCUMENT IS ATTACHED.

Respectfully submitted,
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

Dated: January 24, 2005   By:

Richard Martinelli
Registration No. 52,003
415-8700   Telephone
415-8701   Facsimile

Correspondence Address:
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.
3 World Financial Center
New York, NY 10281-2101

893219 v3